



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/682,212	10/08/2003	Jurgen Lappohn	LAPPOHN - 4	8089
25889	7590	09/22/2004	EXAMINER	
WILLIAM COLLARD COLLARD & ROE, P.C. 1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD ROSLYN, NY 11576			VU, HIEN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

an

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/682,212

Applicant(s)

LAPPOHN, JURGEN

Examiner

Hien D. Vu

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/08/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 2856

1. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms, which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are: page 9, lines 14, 15 and 18, the terms of elements 5 are not consistent; page 11, line 20 and page 12, lines 7, 9, 13, the terms of elements 18, 19 and 19' are not consistent; page 3, lines 20-21, "an essentially block-shaped corpus" is unclear.

The disclosure should also be carefully reviewed to ensure that any and all grammatical, idiomatic and spelling or other minor errors are corrected.

2. Claims 1-10 are objected to because in claims 1 & 8, line 4 the features "an essentially block-shaped corpus" are unclear claim 1, line 8, its thickness lacks an antecedent basis; claim 8, line 12, "its first segment" is unclear.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

4.(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2 & 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Casey (646).

Insofar as the claims can be understood due to the indefiniteness, above the disclosure of Casey provides a complete response to each and every element set forth in the claims. For example. Figs. 10-16 show a plurality of contacts 124, a molded

Art Unit: 2856

plastic retaining body 122 is read as the recited essentially block-shaped corpus, an electrical shielding 128 having at least one shield plate (not labeled) having a weakening in a region of a bending site between a first segment and a second segment of the shielding plate.

As to claim 2, the weakening is arranged on an inside of the bending site as shown in fig. 16.

As to claim 7, the corpus 122 is made of plastic.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3-6 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casey (646) in view of Cohen (076) and Brown et al (329).

As to claims 3, 4, & 6, Casey does not show the shielding plate having at least one recess on the second segment for receiving at least one catch hook which is integrally formed on the corpus. Cohen, figs. 1 & 7 show a shielding plate 242 having at least one recess 162a, b for receiving at least one catch hook 158 which is integrally formed on a corpus 138. It would have been obvious to one skill in the art to modify the connector of Casey by forming the shield plate with at least one recess on the second segment for receiving at least one catch hook which is integrally formed on the corpus, as taught by Cohen, in order to retain the shield plate to the corpus.

Art Unit: 2856

Also it would have been obvious to one with skill in the art to modify the connector of Casey by forming the corpus with positioning projections for interacting with corresponding positioning recesses on the plate as shown in fig. 1 of Cohen in order to retain the shield plate to the corpus.

As to claim 5, fig. 12 of Casey show additional catch devices (not labeled) formed on the first segment of the plate and on the front of the corpus.

As to claim 8, the claim recite method steps substantially corresponding to the connector claims 1 and 3, therefore, it is rejected under the similar rationale.

As to claims 9-10, Casey does not show the connector being positioned on a circuit board and the shielding plate with a free end passing through the circuit board and is anchor in place, however such features are old and well known in the art as shown in Brown (329), therefore, to provide such features on the connector of Casey would have been obvious to retain the shield plate and the connector body to a circuit board.

8. Mitra, Mair et al and Talend et al are cited for disclosure of shielded connector assembly.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Thomas Noland at telephone number (571) 272-2202.

HV/ds

09/14/04



HIEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER